



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/220,063	12/23/1998	STEPHANE AMARGER	1807.0631	3987

5514 7590 10/10/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2002

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/220,063	AMARGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claim 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Masumoto et al. (US 6,134,020)

Regarding claim 48: Masumoto teaches a device (20, fig. 1) for determining conditions for processing (print resolution based on text or graphic, fig. 46) to be carried out on data in a file (column 6, lines 52-55), by at least one input/output means (30, Fig. 1) which modulates a physical quantity, (column 8, lines 40-46) comprising: means (the program of the printer driver that detects the presence of text or graphic, column 79, lines 50-60) for determining if at least some data in the file are image data, text data or graphics data, and configuration determination means (the program of the printer driver that control print head resolution, column 80, lines 1-2) adapted, without modifying the data, to take into account the determining result obtained by the determining means of the processing of the data in order to determine for determining a

Art Unit: 2624

configuration (different print head resolution, column 80, lines 1-2) of a pilot (print head, column 80, lines 1-2) of the input/output means designated to implement the processing.

Regarding claim 49: Claim 49 is claiming a method of the apparatus discussed in claim 48. Please see discussion on claim 48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-13, 15, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111).

Regarding claims 1, 26: Lobiondo teaches a device (scheduler, column 3, lines 41-45) for determining (column 4, lines 45-50) conditions for processing (criteria, column 3, lines 54-55) to be carried out on data in a file (column 3, line 66), by at least one input/output means (printer, column 3, line 31) which modulates a physical quantity, (sets of document, column 4, line 35) comprising: means (the program software (column 3, line 46) that determines printing criteria, column 4, lines 45-50) for determining semantics of the processing of the data, and configuration determination means (the program software (column 3, line 46) that determines printer capabilities (configuration), column 4, lines 1-10) adapted, without modifying the data, (print data is not modified when checking capabilities of printers) to take into account the semantics of the processing of the data in order to determine for determining a configuration (printer

Art Unit: 2624

capabilities (configuration), column 4, lines 1-10) of the input/output means (printer) designated to implement the processing.

Lobiondo does not teach determining a configuration of a pilot of the input/output means designated to implement the processing.

Marbry et al. teaches that when determining the configuration of a printer for printing a print job, (column 1, lines 65-66, column 2, lines 1-11), the configuration of the printer correspond to a printer driver (pilot) would also need to be determined in order to have the printer drive having the right printer configuration to process print data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo to include: determining a configuration of a pilot of the input/output means designated to implement the processing.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo by the teaching of Marbry et al. because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the print data processing system of Lobiondo to have the correct printer drive (pilot) for processing the print data; and (b) it would have ensured users of getting a print job printed according to users selected specifications.

Regarding claims 2, 27: Lobiondo teaches wherein: the processing is carried out by at least two input/output means, (column 4, lines column 4, line 64) and the pilot configuration used by the configuration determination means includes selection (selecting of a printer requires the

Art Unit: 2624

selection of a printer driver, (pilot) see discussion of claim 1) of the input/output means intended to implement the processing.

Regarding claims 3, 28: Lobiondo teaches the device, including: means (the program software (column 3, line 46) that communicates with user, column 5, lines 20-35) of dialoguing with a user adapted to transmit questions (prompt the user, column 5, line 25) to the user and to receive information from the user in response, (column 5, line 27) the configuration determination means is also adapted to take into account the information received in response from the user in order to determine the pilot configuration. (selecting of a printer requires the selection of a printer driver, (pilot) see discussion of claim 1, and selecting of a printer depends on the user's response, column 5, lines 25-35).

Regarding claims 4, 29: Lobiondo teaches the device including a memory (database, column 3, lines 65-68) adapted to store information (information relating to print job, column 3, line 67) received in response from the user. (Required completion time entered by user (response) of column 5, lines 25-35 is information relating to print job).

Regarding claims 5, 30: Lobiondo teaches wherein said memory is adapted to also store, associated with each item of information received, an item of information (print job data, column 3, line 58) representing the user who supplied it. (The print data is sent and request to be printed by a user, column 3, lines 55-65. Therefore, the print data send and request to be printed by the user is an item of information representing user who supplied it to be printed)

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 6, and 31: Lobiondo teaches wherein the memory is adapted to also store associated with each item of information received, an item of information representing a concerned document. (Column 3, lines 65-68).

Regarding claims 7, and 32: Lobiondo does not teach the device including pilot updating means for: on the one hand to detect that a pilot of the input/output means intended to implement the processing is not available or is not up to date in a memory, and on the other hand, to read the pilot in another memory.

Marbry teaches pilot updating means (the program that is performing the function step of fig. 5) for: on the one hand to detect that a pilot of the input/output means intended to implement the processing is not available (unsuccessful in retrieving complete information, column 5, line 50-55) or is not up to date in a memory, and on the other hand, to read (copying, column 3, line 31) the pilot in another memory. (Database, column 5, line 66)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo to include: pilot updating means for: on the one hand to detect that a pilot of the input/output means intended to implement the processing is not available or is not up to date in a memory, and on the other hand, to read the pilot in another memory.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo by the teaching of Marbry because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed users using up to date pilot for printing, and (b) it

Art Unit: 2624

would have allowed users obtaining the complete printer configuration information when the printer configuration is not fully available, as taught by abstract of Marbry, and (c) using up to date pilot would ensure print jobs would be successfully printed.

Regarding claims 8, and 33: Lobiondo teaches the device including: means (the program of the scheduler) for checking an availability of input/output means (column 4, lines 45-50) adapted to transmit an item of information representing unavailability for processing of the data, (column 5, lines 20-35) when the means (printer, column 5, line 19) intended to process the data is not available for this purpose; and the determination means (the program of the scheduler, column 3, lines 40-45) is adapted to take into account the unavailability information in order to determine a configuration of another input/output means (column 4, lines 45-50) for implementing the processing of the data.

Regarding claims 9, and 34: Lobiondo teaches a device (scheduler, column 3, lines 40-45) for determining conditions of processing to be carried out on data of a document, (column 4, lines 45-55) by at least one input/output means (printer, column 4, line 48) which uses a physical quantity, (1000 set, column 4, line 35) comprising: quantity determination means (program of scheduler, column 3, lines 40-45) for determining at least two quantities (1000, set column 4, lines 35, and completion time, column 4, lines 56) related to the document; means (program of scheduler, column 3, lines 40-45) for estimating content (1000, set column 4, lines 35, and completion time, column 4, lines 56) of the document, for taking into account each of the at least two quantities, and configuration determination means (program of scheduler, column 3, lines 40-

Art Unit: 2624

45) for taking into account the content of the document in order to determined a configuration of the input output means (the printer that configured in a way the printer is capable of printing the document, column 4, lines 35-65) intended to implement the processing.

Lobiondo does not teach the configuration determination means taking into account the content of the document in order to determine a configuration of the pilot of the input output means intended to implement the processing.

Marbry et al. teach that when determining the configuration of a printer for printing a print job, (column 1, lines 65-66, column 2, lines 1-11), the configuration of the printer correspond to a printer driver (pilot) would also need to be determined in order to have the printer drive having the right printer configuration to process print data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo to include: when the configuration determination means taking into account the content of the document in order to determine a configuration of the input output means intended to implement the processing, the configuration determination means/pilot configuration determination means determines a configuration of the pilot of the input output means intended to implement the processing.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo by the teaching of Marbry et al. because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the print data processing system of Lobiondo to

Art Unit: 2624

have the correct printer drive (pilot) for processing the print data; and (b) it would have ensured users of getting a print job printed according to users selected specifications.

Regarding claims 10, and 35: Lobiondo teaches wherein the quantity determination means is adapted to scrutinize data of the document (column 4, lines 49-50) which are directly accessible to a user (column 3, lines 50-65).

Regarding claims 11, and 36: Lobiondo teaches wherein the quantity determination means is adapted to function without using a software application able to make it possible to modify the content of the document. (The scheduler would determine the completion time, column 4, lines 55-63 without modifying the completion time)

Regarding claims 12, and 37: Lobiondo teaches wherein the quantity determination means is adapted to read at least one quantity in a file. (Printer speed, column 4, lines 1-5, column 3, line 68)

Regarding claims 13, and 38: Lobiondo teaches wherein: the processing is carried out by at least two input/output means (column 4, lines 65-66) and the configuration determination means is adapted to select an input/output means designed to implement the process. (Column 4, lines 45-55)

Regarding claims 15 and 40: Lobiondo teaches wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a number of digital information items (1000 set of document, column 4, line 35) in the document.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 19, and 46: Lobiondo teaches the device including a means of determining parts (set of document column 4, lines 35, and completion time, column 4, lines 56) of the document, wherein: the determination means is adapted to determine at least two quantities (document set column 4, lines 35, and completion time, column 4, lines 56) relating to each of the parts, the content estimation means (the program of the scheduler, column 3, lines 40-45) is adapted to estimate (determined, column 4, lines 47-49) content of each of the parts, (set of document column 4, lines 35, and completion time, column 4, lines 56) taking into account each quantity relating to the part, and the configuration determination means is adapted to take into account content of the part in order to determine the configuration of the input output means (printer, column 4, lines 45-50) intended to implement the processing on the part.

Lobiondo does not teach the configuration determination means taking into account the content of the document in order to determine a configuration of the pilot of the input output means intended to implement the processing on the part.

Marbry et al. teaches that when determining the configuration of a printer for printing a print job, (column 1, lines 65-66, column 2, lines 1-11), the configuration of the printer correspond to a printer driver (pilot) would also need to be determined in order to have the printer drive having the right printer configuration to process print data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo to include: when the configuration determination means taking into account the content of the document in order to determine a

Art Unit: 2624

configuration of the input output means intended to implement the processing on the part, the configuration determination means/pilot configuration determination means determines a configuration of the pilot of the input output means intended to implement the processing on the part.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo by the teaching of Marbry et al. because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the print data processing system of Lobiondo to have the correct printer drive (pilot) for processing the print data; and (b) it would have ensured users of getting a print job printed according to users selected specifications.

Regarding claim 20: Lobiondo teaches a printer having a device of claim 1. (Printer, column 3, lines 25)

Regarding claim 21: Lobiondo teaches a facsimile machine, (the device that is creating a facsimile job, column 3, line 61) having a device of claim 1.

Regarding claim 23: Lobiondo teaches a display screen, (user interface, column 3, line 32, 40, fig. 2) having a device of claim 1.

Regarding claim 24: Lobiondo teaches a photographic apparatus, (the device that is creating the copy job, column 3, line 61) having a device of claim 1.

Regarding claim 44: Lobiondo teaches a step of printing the document. (Column 3, lines 45-50).

Art Unit: 2624

4. Claims 14, 39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111) as applied to claims 9, 38, 46 above, and further in view of Barry et al. (U.S. Patent 5,859,711).

Regarding claims 14, 39, and 47: Lobiondo does not teach wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a number of pages in the document represented by the document are determined.

Barry et al., in the same area of printing documents, teach quantity determination means (program of fig. 5) is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a number of pages (232, fig. 5, column 8, lines 30-45) in the document represented by the document are determined.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. to include: the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a number of pages in the document represented by the document are determined.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. by the teaching of Barry et al. because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the system of Lobiondo to route different pages of a document to different printers as taught by Barry et al. at column 10, lines 1-5; and (b) it would have allowed the document to be printed faster by allowing different printer to print different pages of the document.

Art Unit: 2624

5. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111). as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shimizu (U.S. Patent # 5,040,079).

- Regarding claim 22: Lobiondo does not teach a modulator demodulator, having a device of claim 1.

Shimizu, in the same area of printing device, teaches a modulator demodulator, (column 7, line 35-40) used with a printing system. (Column 7, line 30)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. to include: a modulator demodulator, having a device used in the printing system of Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. by the teaching of Shimizu because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the printing system to communicate with other devices by modulating and demodulating signals.

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111). as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent # 5,926,285).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 22: Lobiondo does not teach a camera having an image sensor, having a device of claim 1.

Shimizu, in the same area of printing device, teaches a camera (20, fig. 1) having an image sensor, used with a printing system. (91, fig. 1)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. to include: a camera having an image sensor, used in the printing system of Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. by the teaching of Takahashi because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the printing system to print a print job created by a camera.

7. Claims 17, 42, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111) as applied to claims 9, and 34 above, and further in view of Lopresti (U.S. Patent # 6,298,173)

Regarding claims 17, 42 and 45: Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. do not teach wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a degree of compression to be obtained on the document using predetermined compression software.

Art Unit: 2624

Lopresti in the same area of transmitting document data, teaches one of the quantities in document information represents a degree of compression to be obtained on the document using predetermined compression software. (Column 9, lines 15-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. to include: wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a degree of compression to be obtained on the document using predetermined compression software.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. by the teaching of Lopresti because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the printing system to print data with a high compression rate to save memory in storing the document data; (b) it would have allowed the printing system to print good images with a low compression rate.

8. Claims 16, 18, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent # 5,287,194) in view of Marbry et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,692,111) as applied to claims 9, and 34 above, and further in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,184,999)

Regarding claims 16, 18, 41, and 43: Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. do not teach, wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a

Art Unit: 2624

period of time necessary for compression of the document, by predetermined compression software.

Yoshida, in the same area of storing image data, teaches one of the quantities represents a period of time necessary for compression of the document, by predetermined compression software. (Fig. 6, column 6, lines 20-25)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. to include: wherein the quantity determination means is adapted so that one of the quantities represents a period of time necessary for compression of the document, by predetermined compression software.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo in view of Marbry et al. by the teaching of Lopresti because of the following reasons: (a) it would have avoided the compression process overtake the image data available for compression to ensure smooth flowing of image data in the compression software without having to wait for image data.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/31/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2624

With respect to applicant's argument that information used as criteria select the printer are not determined by the system, has been considered.

In reply: Column 4, lines 45-50, Lobiondo, teaches the system (scheduler) used the determined criteria of processing a print job (e.g., color production in a print job) to determine a configuration of a printer such that the configuration of the printer would allow the printer to print job with color production.

With respect to applicant's argument that Lobiondo fails to teach to determine the pilot of a printer, has been considered.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As previously discussed, Lobiondo teaches: using the determined criteria of processing a print job (e.g., color production in a print job) to determine a configuration of a printer such that the configuration of the printer would allow the printer to print jobs with color production.

Lobiondo does not teach determining a configuration of a pilot of the input/output means designated to implement the processing.

Marbry et al. teaches that when determining the configuration of a printer for printing a print job, (column 1, lines 65-66, column 2, lines 1-11), the configuration of the printer correspond to a printer driver (pilot) would also need to be determined in order to have the

Art Unit: 2624

printer drive having the right printer configuration to process print data. For example, a printer with having color inks (printer configuration) such that the printer would print colors. However, the printer configuration information in the printer drive does not show that the printer having color inks. The printer drive would not send command to the printer to control the use of color inks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo to include: determining a configuration of a pilot of the input/output means designated to implement the processing.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lobiondo by the teaching of Marbry et al. because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed the print data processing system of Lobiondo to have the correct printer drive (pilot) for processing the print data; and (b) it would have ensured users of getting a print job printed according to users selected specifications.

Action is Final, Necessitated by Amendment

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection presented in this office action. Therefore, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2624

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTHS shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892 or to Supervisor Mr. David Moore whose phone number is (703) 308-7452.

October 3, 2002



**GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**